



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,887	03/09/2004	Fred D. Rampey	DISC.01US01	5046
1933	7590	11/10/2005	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 5TH AVE FL 16 NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			TRAN, QUOC DUC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	
DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/797,887

Applicant(s)

RAMPEY ET AL

Examiner

Quoc D. Tran

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 11-13 and 59-61 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase “may be” is not a positive limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9, 15, 17, 20-25, 28-36, 38, 40, 43-48 and 51-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Srinivasan (5,724,412).

Consider claims 1, 29-31 and 34, Srinivasan teaches a speech to text conversion system and method for converting voice information to text information for a specified user associated with a Caller ID comprising: a telephony device that transmits said voice information (col. 3 lines 50-55); a telephone network that receives said voice information from said telephony device and transmits said voice information and said Caller ID to said communications server (see Fig. 1); a communications server that receives said voice information and said Caller ID; an account disposed in said communications server that is accessed by and linked to said Caller ID, said account including routing information that routes text information to a specified destination and having a speech recognition system configured specifically for said user that converts said voice information to said text information; a router disposed in said communications server that

Art Unit: 2643

automatically transmits said text information to said specified destination (col. 4 lines 3-26; col. 5 lines 21-39).

Consider claims 2, 32 and 35, Srinivasan teaches wherein said communications server further comprises a storage device that stores said voice information (col. 5 lines 6-20).

Consider claims 3, 33 and 36, Srinivasan teaches wherein said communications server further comprises a storage device that stores said text information (col. 5 lines 6-20).

Consider claims 4-9 and 52-57, Srinivasan teaches the claimed limitations (col. 5 lines 31-34).

Consider claims 15, 17, 20-25, 38, 40 and 43-48 Srinivasan teaches the claimed limitations (col. 1 lines 50-55).

Consider claims 28 and 51, Srinivasan teaches wherein said telephony device is a wireline telephony device (col. 3 lines 50-55).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-13, 27, 50 and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (5,724,412) in view of Rabe et al (5,764,730).

Consider claims 10-13 and 58-61, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein the Caller ID is an Electronic Serial Number from a wireless telephony device and wherein said Caller ID is information stored within a Subscriber Identification Module which may be installed in a

Art Unit: 2643

wireless telephony device. However, Rabe et al suggested such (col. 4 lines 1-52; col. 6 lines 3-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rabe et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide caller information from different networks.

Consider claims 27 and 50, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein said telephony device is a wireless telephony device. However, Rabe et al suggest such (Fig. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rabe et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide caller information from different networks.

6. Claims 14 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (5,724,412) in view of Minborg et al (5,922,721).

Consider claims 14 and 37, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein said text information is encrypted prior to being transmitted to said specified destination. However, Minborg et al suggested such (col. 6 lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Minborg et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide a secured transmission of data.

7. Claims 16, 18, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (5,724,412) in view of Skog (5,930,701).

Consider claims 16, 18, 39 and 41, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein said specified destination is a text capable mobile telephone and text capable pager. However, Skog suggested such (col. 1 lines 13-54; col. 7 lines 21-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the

Art Unit: 2643

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Skog et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide caller information from different networks.

8. Claims 19 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (5,724,412) in view of Wu et al (6,813,489).

Consider claims 19 and 42, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein said specified destination is a wireless email device. However, Wu et al suggested such (col. 4 lines 35-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Skog et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide caller information from different networks.

9. Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (5,724,412) in view of Delaney et al (6,842,772).

Consider claims 26 and 49, Srinivasan did not suggest wherein said specified destination is a fax machine. However, Delaney et al suggested such (col. 4 lines 40-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Delaney et al into view of Srinivasan in order to provide caller information from different networks.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2643

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

**(571) 273-8300**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:


Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511**. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, TH and Friday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7499**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2600**.

**QUOCTRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**



AU 2643

November 8, 2005